

Appln. No. 09/869,640  
Amdt dated April 15, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of November 17, 2004

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action of November 17, 2004, the Examiner objected to claims 50, 51 and 52 based upon informalities identified by the Examiner. By the present response, claims 50, 51 and 52 have been amended to correct the informalities identified by the Examiner.

In the Office Action, claims 1-49 and 53-65 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention.

By the present response, claims 1, 22, 34 and 53 have been amended to correct the limitation "the Farey quadrature" to provide proper antecedent basis. Claims 26, 28, 30 and 34 have been amended to include proper antecedent basis for the term "the calculation". Claims 27 and 29 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for the term "the Fourier transform". Claim 54 has been amended to provide the required antecedent basis for the term "the combination".

Based upon the amendments to the claims, the applicant is believed to have addressed all of the §112 rejections raised by the Examiner such that the claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's undersigned attorney with any questions or comments, or to otherwise facilitate prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP



Joseph D. Kuborn  
Reg. No. 40,689

100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202  
Attorney Docket No.: 4254-00060  
Telephone No. (414) 271-7590  
Attorney Docket No. 4199-00005